

not later than December 31, 1996, on the results of the actions taken under subsection (a), together with any recommendations as to how to further reduce energy costs and energy consumption in the future. Each report shall specify the agency's total facilities energy costs and shall identify the reductions achieved and specify the actions that resulted in such reductions.

AMENDMENT NO. 1832

On page 60, line 1, strike all through the period on line 17.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed immediately to vote on the passage of the bill with no other intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall the bill pass?

So the bill (H.R. 1854), as amended, was passed.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MACK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I will take this opportunity to congratulate the managers of the first appropriations bill to come to the floor, Senator MACK of Florida and Senator MURRAY of Washington State. We started them off here on the trail to sort of get a feel of the body in terms of acting on these appropriations measures. They have not only demonstrated the skill in putting the bill together in the committee framework, but certainly here managing on the floor.

Mr. President, this is a very tough year for the Appropriations Committee. It is a tough year for all Members, but especially the Appropriations Committee, because in effect we are playing the implementer, the mortician, the executioner, and many other roles in terms of the budget resolution and all the other various forces that are forcing Members to face up to some of these fiscal problems.

I hope that at an appropriate time we reconsider an action that would permit legislation on appropriations, because this type of legislation attracts all kinds of policy issues. It should not be on this bill or on any other appropriations bill. We must resist that effort on the floor and on the part of the committee. Since we found the test case, we will bring some more appropriations bills. But I want to thank these managers.

I have one further point to make, and that is when I visited Antarctica and was introduced to the culture of penguins, and one of the things about the culture was that there are seals, giants seals under the ice. The penguins go along the edge of the ice looking into the water to see if there are any seals there, and they are not certain by their vision. So pretty soon they nudge one

into the water, and if they swim away, there are no seals and the others jump in.

So to speak, an analogy can be drawn here tonight. We have had the seal test and it has passed well. I congratulate my colleagues.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I want to thank the chairman. At least, I think I want to thank the chairman for his remarks. I appreciate that and appreciate his assistance as we have begun this process.

I also want to thank Keith Kennedy and Larry Harris for the work they have done to prepare us and the bill and to assist as we move forward. And again, to Senator MURRAY, it has been a pleasure working with the Senator through conference and completing the bill.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I, too, want to thank the appropriations chair, as well as the ranking member, Senator BYRD, who have been very helpful in this process, and in particular to thank the Senator from Florida, Senator MACK, for a job well done.

We have not agreed on every part, but he has been wonderful to work with and I appreciate his willingness to step down and go through this with me. I thank him, and Jim English, who worked with me.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with you on my first bill, Senator.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S. 1817

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 9 a.m. on Friday the Senate begin consideration of H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AP-
PROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL
DISASTER ASSISTANCE, FOR
ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES,
FOR ASSISTANCE IN THE RECOVER-
Y FROM THE TRAGEDY THAT
OCCURRED AT OKLAHOMA CITY,
AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1944) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1883

(Purpose: To strike certain rescissions, and to provide an offset)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, proposes an amendment numbered 1833.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On page 38, strike lines 24 and 25 and insert the following: "under this heading in Public Law 103-333, \$204,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That section 2007(b) (relating to the administrative and travel expenses of the Department of Defense) is amended by striking "rescinded" the last place the term appears and inserting "rescinded, and an additional amount of \$319,000,000 is rescinded": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available".

Beginning on page 34, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 35, line 10, and insert the following: "Public Law 103-333, \$1,125,254,000 are rescinded, including \$10,000,000 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of new Job Corps centers, \$2,500,000 for the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, \$4,293,000 for section 401 of the Job Training Partnership Act, \$5,743,000 for section 402 of such Act, \$3,861,000 for service delivery areas under section 101(a)(4)(A)(iii) of such Act, \$100,010,000 for carrying out title II, part C of such Act, \$2,223,000 for the National Commission for Employment Policy and \$500,000 for the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee: *Provided*, That of such \$1,125,254,000, not more than \$43,000,000 may be rescinded from amounts made available to carry out part A of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act, not more than \$35,600,000 may be rescinded from amounts made available to carry out title III of the Job Training Partnership Act, and no portion may be rescinded from funds made available to carry out section 738 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act: *Provided further*, That service delivery areas may".

On page 41, strike lines 6 through 11 and insert the following:

"Public Law 103-333, \$91,959,000 are rescinded as follows: From the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title II-B, \$29,000,000, title V-C, \$16,000,000, title IX-B, \$3,000,000, title X-D, \$1,500,000, title X-G, \$1,185,000, section 10602, \$1,399,000, and title XIII-A,".

Beginning on page 43, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 44, line 2, and insert the following: "Public Law 103-333, \$13,425,000 are rescinded as follows: From the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title III-B, \$5,000,000, title".

On page 107, line 21, (relating to the administrative and travel expenses of the Department of Defense) strike "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$382,342,000".

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WELLSTONE for starting this ball and getting this issue and debate going.

Frankly, in spite of the fact that I know there are a number of people who are concerned about this particular legislation and where it is going, I think it is absolutely regrettable that we are just taking up as important an issue as this at 10:55 p.m. on a Thursday night following a major debate around the legislative appropriations bill.

The rescission issue has been held somewhat in limbo for the last couple of weeks, in large part because Senator WELLSTONE and I both argued and agreed and suggested to our colleagues that the issues raised, the substantive issues raised in the rescissions action was too important to be let go in what Senator WELLSTONE called in a stealth manner.

Forgive me, Mr. President, it is late, and I think we are all a little bleary-eyed, but the fact is we are now taking up, in fact, in stealth fashion, and limiting debate, on what I think is a very vitally important issue that should have had the kind of debate around priorities and around the import and the significance of the rescissions legislation in the context of where we are going with the budget.

I was actually kind of delighted to hear Senator HATFIELD's description of the seal test, because if anything, in terms of a seal test, this rescission legislation, I think, indicated the first step that we are taking as a legislative body in responding to the desperate need—and I think it is a desperate need—to get our fiscal house in order.

Last year, Mr. President, I cosponsored the balanced budget amendment, because I believed that if we were serious about our future, if we were serious about not handing to the next generation a legacy of debt, if we were serious about reducing Federal deficits and taking the steps necessary to achieve balance, to get on the glidepath to a balanced budget and not bankrupting the country by the turn of the century, if we were going to do that, we ought to move in the direction of trying to achieve budget balance.

The good news, Mr. President, is that this time the Senate, in the budget that has been adopted, did achieve budget balance, or headed in the direction of budget balance, or put us on the glidepath in that direction. The bad news, in my opinion, it did it in a way that speaks very poorly of priorities and speaks very poorly of the allocation of contribution by various sectors of our population.

If anything, the problem with the rescissions bill, and I point out to those night owls who are listening and who get sometimes turned off by the more technical language that we use, a rescissions bill is taking back. It is a take-back.

It is the first step. It takes back money that was appropriated last year and says OK, we are not going to do that after all. We are going to rescind, we are going to turn that around, and then we are going to go forward. So in that regard the take-back bill from last year's appropriations effort in the context of this session is the seal test, in some ways, that the Senator from Oregon referred to. It is the first step that we take on the glidepath toward a balanced budget.

Unfortunately, the seal test and the first step that is taken by this rescissions bill, I believe, calls for more sac-

rifice from the most vulnerable populations in our country than ought to be the case in any rescission package or, frankly, in this budget.

In fact, by one analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, it was found after analyzing the numbers and how the cuts weigh in, the center found that some 62 percent of the cuts in this rescissions bill would come from discretionary programs to serve low- and moderate-income individuals, even though that group of Americans represent only 12 percent of discretionary spending overall.

That sounds kind of technical, 62 percent for low- and moderate-income individuals. But the cuts that this bill would have us undertake come in areas that, frankly, again, I just, for one, not only personally cannot accept, but that I believe would be inappropriate for us to accept as our first step on this glidepath. If anything, our priorities ought to reflect shared sacrifice. We are going to have to all step up to the plate as Americans and make some sacrifice in order to get our fiscal house in order. We are all going to have to make a contribution to resolving budget deficits and to getting us on a glidepath, if you will, to budget balance, at least a glidepath that is opposite to the trends that we have taken, that we are taking right now.

I served as a member of the President's Bipartisan Commission on Entitlements and Tax Reform. There was no question, if there is one message out of the entire hearings and the information that we looked at in terms of the budget, it was that current trends, budget trends are unsustainable and that we had to change the way that we do business. That is one of the reasons why this rescissions bill is so important and that is why I believed, and still believe, that it was so critically necessary to have the debate in the sunshine, to have the debate in the daytime, to allow people to know what it was that we were talking about, what was at stake and what were the issues.

In the first instance, among the cuts in this bill that are sought to be restored by the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun division, and it is a division because the amendment is in two parts, among the restorations are a program that I have worked on, education infrastructure, to help rebuild some of the dilapidated schools around this country, schools that are falling apart. I do not think it is a secret, at this point, given the discussion about the condition of American schools, our schools are falling apart. They are not equipped to prepare our youngsters for the 21st century. We do not have the infrastructure in them even to make them computer ready, if you will. In many instances, the electricity is not there.

So we are really, I think, missing the boat and really shortchanging our children by refusing to even take some small steps toward getting our schools in better shape. But that was cut. That

program was terminated altogether in this legislation.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—that was cut by \$15 million. Again, youngsters who have difficulty going to school for fear of being shot by the drug dealers, that kind of a cut is a major impediment to their education.

Education technology, another \$17 million cut. You talk education technology, it is clear what that is; the whole idea we are going into this information age without allowing our youngsters to get adequately prepared.

Eisenhower Professional Development, to help teachers be better teachers. Again, another set of cuts. This one, Eisenhower Professional Development, was cut by \$69 million. Again, I think that is inappropriate.

Then we get to the really difficult cuts. I say really difficult only because it hits people who are probably more in need than just about any other group: Homeless veterans jobs training. The homeless veterans job training program was cut by \$5 million. How we can cut something for homeless veterans, in terms of job training, is a mystery to me. Yet that was a decision that was made as part of this rescissions compromise.

Displaced worker training. With all the base closings and all the dislocations in our economy with job downsizing and the like, again, to cut displaced worker training by \$67 million seemed to me to be inappropriate.

Adult job training was cut, JTPA adult job training, cut by \$58 million. JTPA youth training cut by \$272 million. Again, in communities particularly where there is less than—and there are communities in this country, Mr. President, and I am sure you are aware of them—in which there is about 1 percent—in fact I will be specific. In a community in the city of Chicago, in my State of Illinois, 1 percent private employment, 1 percent. That is economic meltdown. If we do not undertake some steps to provide for job training and job readiness for people who live in communities with 1 percent private employment in them we are setting ourselves up for a black hole to develop in our social fabric from which we may never recover. Again, those cuts, it seems to me, are inappropriate. And as the seal test, as that first step on the glidepath, seems to me to be the absolute wrong place for us to go.

Interestingly, this amendment calls for an offset. Because we are all talking about, "Can we pay for these things?" The offset which would pay for these restorations, which the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun amendment suggests, comes from the administration and travel budget of the Department of Defense. According to the General Accounting Office, the DOD has that money and money to spare when it comes to administration and travel. Certainly, the absorption of these costs would not be something that would

cripple the ability of our military to travel around the world.

So it would seem, starting from the notion that there ought to be shared sacrifice, the amendment that Senator WELLSTONE and I put together—again I hope he will be able to talk about in the sunshine—would have gone a long way to restoring our capacity to respond to some of the most vulnerable populations and respond to people who are least able to take the impact of the cuts of this rescission legislation.

The second part, the second division of the amendment has to do with the Low Income Home Energy Assistant Program, LIHEAP. Mr. President, I know you probably noticed in the newspapers, in the city of Chicago in this last couple of weeks we had a heat wave that left almost 300 people dead. Mr. President, 300 people died because they could not physically tolerate the heat that came into the city. Chicago, IL, does not have a cooling assistance program under LIHEAP, although those things are allowed. It does not have a cooling assistance program but it does have heating assistance. It is one thing about the city of Chicago, and the State really, but as beautiful as it is, it is known for some extremes of temperature. It can go from having 300 people die because there is no assistance and they are too poor to move to the nearby hotel into an air-conditioned room, but at the same time, come winter, when the temperatures fall to below zero, it is just as likely that in the absence of LIHEAP, in the absence of heating assistance for poor people, we will see the same kind of loss of life and the same kind of attendant tragedy.

That is a preventable tragedy and it has been prevented over time by the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. It is a program that provided energy assistance for heating and cooling to economically disadvantaged individuals, particularly senior citizens, particularly the elderly, in all 50 States. The LIHEAP program was cut by \$319 million in this rescissions package and I daresay, given the need for the assistance, particularly for senior citizens, given the vulnerability of these populations to die when the temperature gets over 100 degrees or die when it gets under 32, it was inappropriate for us to take that kind of cut, inappropriate for us to head on this glidepath, calling on them to make a sacrifice that, unfortunately, in all too many instances, could well be the supreme sacrifice.

So that is what this amendment is about. I know we have 30 minutes tomorrow to debate this issue. I know, also, there are other things about this legislation that encourage my colleagues to want to move it quickly.

As I stated from the beginning of this debate, I was never interested, no one was interested in holding up relief for California or relief for Oklahoma City, and those are parts of this rescissions legislation. So no one has been inter-

ested in doing that. But at the same time, for us to respond to those emergencies and at the same time trample over the emergency that is faced by the low-income individuals who have faced 62 percent of the cuts in this bill seems to me to take a wrong step, in the wrong direction, in the wrong way.

So we thought it appropriate and believe it appropriate to have a chance to talk at length about these issues. While we will get to talk about it for half an hour tomorrow morning, and we will be able to pass the issue, there are other parts of this legislation of the rescissions bill that are problematic. There are some environmental issues that are problematic.

But, again, we all know that part of the legislative process is that things that you do not like often get wrapped up in things that you do like. In fact, one of my colleagues a few moments ago used an expression that I have liked to use over the years. The expression is that those who love the law and who love sausages should not watch either of them being made. Quite frankly, this legislation, I think, fits into that category very well because it has a combination of some palatable initiatives such as California and Oklahoma City, and then an awful lot that would just make you, in my opinion, gag on what has happened here.

Quite frankly, I think that the issue that is on fire is the one that we really do need to engage, an entire legislative body with everybody participating and talking about—the direction that our country will take as we try to achieve budget balance and integrity in the way we handle these fiscal year issues.

Quite frankly, one of the things people ask me very often is, "What do you like about being in the Senate?" And I tell them that I cannot imagine—I am sure the Presiding Officer will relate to this—I cannot imagine a more exciting time to serve in the U.S. Senate or to serve in policymaking, the policy of a legislative body of our Government, precisely because so many of the issues that have been around for a long time, as well as issues that are new to our time, are now facing us four square and calling on us for resolution, calling on us to express an opinion; issues that 5 years ago did not get talked about. I mean, when they were building up huge budget deficits nobody really talked about it. What should be our foreign policy? You had a Soviet Union. It was pretty clear-cut. Now we have to construct something.

What is going to be the direction in terms of diversity? We just had the vote on affirmative action. What kind of economy are we going to have in the future? All of these issues and a host more that I know I could stand here probably the rest of the night to talk about, all of these issues are before us now.

So when it comes to specifically the issue of budget priorities, now is the time for us to take up that debate and not to handle it willy-nilly. Let us get

it done, kind of make those sausages faster, but in a way to allow us to really have a comprehensive and coherent debate and input from every Member of this U.S. Senate. That is what we were sent here to do.

Again, to the extent that my colleagues had concern that the holding up of this legislation would have untold effects, I am optimistic that those effects will not be untold and that we will be able to go forward, and hopefully we will pass the Wellstone/Moseley-Braun amendment. I am not unrealistic about that. But I would encourage my colleagues to take a look at the amendment, a serious look at the amendment, recognizing that we have to have deep and painful cuts in some regards.

But the question I put to every Member as you take up the issue of how to vote on this amendment to the rescissions bill is whether or not low-income individuals should have to suffer 62 percent of that pain. I do not think they do. And I hope that is not the signal and the message that gets sent by this body tomorrow when we take this issue up to vote.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

SUBSTITUTE SALVAGE PROGRAM

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my serious concerns about H.R. 1944, the fiscal year 1995 rescissions bill. I'll get right to the point: this is a bad bill. Its relevance to the budget process in Washington, DC, is minimal, and its relevance to the American people is marginal.

This bill cuts \$16 billion from the Federal budget. We recently passed a resolution that cut over \$1 trillion; what's the logic in even debating this bill? We have only a few days left in the fiscal year, and yet we are proposing to go back and cut already-appropriated funds for virtually no good policy reason. This bill cuts commitments and goes back on promises made by this Senate less than 1 year ago.

This bill has another problem. I believe the language about timber salvage included in the bill by my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, will backfire. I believe it will hurt—not help—timber communities and workers in the Northwest.

Mr. President, this timber salvage authorizing language is designed to accomplish three things: respond to a timber salvage problem resulting from last year's forest fires and recent insect infestations; speed the rate of timber sales under the President's forest plan, option 9; and release a few timber sales remaining from legislation passed by Congress 4 years ago.

These are goals with which I agree. My problem is with the method. I believe the language contained in this bill will cause a blizzard of lawsuits, cause political turmoil within the Northwest, and take us right back to where we were 4 years ago.

Our region has been at the center of a war over trees fought in the courtrooms and Congress for almost a decade. We have a history of waiving environmental laws to try and solve timber problems; that strategy has not worked.

In fact, that strategy has made the situation worse. Until 1993, the Forest Service was paralyzed by lawsuits, the courts were managing the forests, and public discourse in the region was dominated by acrimony. The language in this bill will reopen those old wounds. Mr. President, I strongly believe that would not be in the best interest of the region.

During floor consideration of this bill last spring, I offered an amendment that would have taken a more moderate approach to salvage operations. My amendment was narrowly defeated 46-48. I respect the will of the Senate in that regard. However, when the rescissions bill reached the President's desk, he vetoed it, citing among other things problems with the timber language.

Mr. President, I learned before the July recess that a deal was being worked out on this issue. Despite my obvious interest in and concern about the salvage issue, I was not involved in the negotiations. I was not consulted during the process. Had I been, I would have been more than willing to work out a compromise in good faith. Unfortunately, that did not happen. I have reviewed the language, and frankly, I still have very serious concerns.

The language in the bill before us is almost exactly the same as was contained in the conference report vetoed by the President, with three minor changes. While these changes may add flexibility, the fundamental problems in the bill remain: it rolls over current laws governing land management, and it cuts the public completely out of the process. Therefore, I cannot support it.

Mr. President, there is a legitimate salvage issue right now throughout the West. Last year's fire season was one of the worst ever. There are hundreds of thousands of acres with burned trees rotting where they burned. I believe that many of these trees can and should be salvaged and put to good public use.

I believe there is a right way and a wrong way to salvage damaged timber on Federal lands. The wrong way is to short-cut environmental checks and balances. The wrong way is to cut people out of the process. The wrong way is to invite a mountain of lawsuits.

The right way is to expedite compliance with the law. The right way is to ensure that agencies work together and make correct decisions quickly. The right way is to let people participate in the process—so they don't clog up the courts later. My amendment, and my approach to the negotiations, would have focused on these points.

Mr. President, there is a reasonable, responsible approach to ensuring salvage operations move forward. Unfortunately, the bill before us doesn't

take it. Instead, it recklessly goes too far, too fast.

Attaching a major harvesting amendment to an appropriations bill like this—worked out at the last minute, behind closed doors—is no way to make good public policy. Instead, the timber language should be developed through the normal authorizing process. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], has a bill pending in his committee that would establish a forest health program. There have been some hearings on that bill, and I have already stated my interest in working with him on his bill.

Mr. President, there have been numerous editorials and articles written about this provision, most of which have urged the President and the Congress to reject these sweeping changes. In addition, recent statistics on employment and growth rates within the timber industry indicate the picture of the industry is not as bleak as some have predicted. I ask unanimous consent to insert some of these materials in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mrs. MURRAY. In summary, I believe this is the wrong bill at the wrong time. The Senate has passed its own balanced budget resolution, and recently passed the conference report. The cuts in this rescissions bill are palsy by comparison. And the timber salvage provisions go too far without adequate safeguards and public participation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this unnecessary, harmful bill.

EXHIBIT 1

WESTERN STATES GAIN 14,251 IN TIMBER JOBS— JANUARY 1993—SPRING 1995

(In thousands)

States	Timber related jobs		
	January 1993	December 1994	April/May 1995
Utah	3,863	5,131
Washington	51,700	54,700
Oregon	61,200	61,600
New Mexico	2,100	2,100
Colorado	10,400	12,100
Arizona	6,400	8,500
Idaho	16,017	16,500
California	84,400	90,600
Montana	8,000	7,100
Totals	244,080	7,231	251,100

These figures are based on the most current data available from state economists. The numbers represent job losses or gains in the lumber, wood manufacturing, paper and allied industries.

The net gain in timber jobs since the 1992 elections for these eight western states is 14,251 jobs. There is no need for salvage sufficiency language.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, June 1995]

CLINTON'S VETO THE RIGHT ACTION

President Clinton has done the right thing in vetoing a bill that made the wrong cuts in the budget and left too much leeway for cheating in salvage timber sales in the Northwest.

The president said it's wrong to cut education programs but to fund members of Congress' pet pork-barrel projects such as roads. The bill cut \$16.4 billion from previously approved social programs.

"We must recognize that the only deficit in this country is not the budget deficit. There's a deficit in this country in the number of drug-free children. There's a deficit . . . in the number of safe schools. There's an education deficit," he said in wielding the pen for his first veto.

It took perhaps even more courage for the president to set himself up for cheap-shot charges by Northwest Republican lawmakers that he is anti-job because he insists that the nation's forests be harvested under rule of law. But there are sure to be further attempts to circumvent proper practices, and Clinton should stand tall against them.

The bill, using poorly defined criteria, would have given the timber industry three penalty-free years to remove "damaged" trees that pose a fire threat. The trees would have been removed without the benefit of the standard environmental safeguards that are meant to protect salmon streams and watersheds, and citizens would have been legally barred from filing suit to object to any violation of environmentally sound harvesting no matter how gross.

The salvage program must get under way, and Congress is perfectly capable of passing legislation that provides for responsible removal of trees that pose a fire hazard without abandoning environmental safeguards.

But by sending the White House an irresponsible proposal for timber salvage, Congress has thrown away valuable time and risked further fire losses in the Northwest woods.

Members of this state's delegation should have insisted on using their time to prepare an acceptable plan for this summer's fire season rather than in devising a political booby-trap for the president.

LOGGING BILL FLAWED

A case can be made for salvage logging of some federal forest lands that have a dangerous accumulation of dead or diseased trees that pose a fire hazard.

But a case cannot be made for the sweeping salvage-logging proposal now under consideration in Congress that sets aside environmental safeguards and promises to raid the treasury for the benefit of private timber companies.

The overly broad language of the bill renders it unacceptable; more important, existing law makes it unnecessary.

The bill arbitrarily mandates a doubling of the amount of timber to be felled over the next two years from federal lands, whether or not that much timber needs to be salvaged, and thus opens the door for a giveaway of public property.

That's because it cleverly stipulates that no so-called "health management activities" directed by the legislation shall be precluded simply because they cost more than the revenues derived from sale of the salvaged timber.

And the bill says that any environmental review, however cursory it may be, "shall be deemed to have satisfied the law."

Sponsors wrongly imply that the bill is needed to permit the Forest Service to conduct salvage logging. But Sierra Club attorney Todd True notes, "Existing law already gives the agency authority" for whatever salvage logging it deems necessary due to threat of fire and insect infestations.

Last summer's huge, costly fires in Eastern Washington forests provided clear evidence of the folly of the Forest Service's past policy of suppressing natural wildfires. It

bears noting that the agency followed that practice partly to protect adjoining commercial timberlands.

If Congress doesn't gut the Forest Service's budget for environmental impact studies, those important reviews can be done in a timely manner and permit defensible salvage-logging operations.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 22, 1995]

THE LOGGER'S AX: NO WILD SWINGS—CLINTON SHOULD HOLD FIRM AGAINST AMENDMENT THAT THREATENS FORESTS

In the early days of his presidency, Bill Clinton productively approached the volatile issue of forest management by breaking with the tired "jobs versus owls" rhetoric of past years. Through his 1993 Forest Summit he showed he understood both the need to preserve dwindling federal forests and the painful dislocations that new limits on logging would cause. He led by talking with all sides and instituting programs to retrain displaced workers. But now, locked in battle with congressional Republicans, Clinton seems to be in danger of abandoning that principled approach.

Last month he rightly vetoed a congressional rescissions bill that was loaded with special-interest riders. One of them, the deceptive "Emergency Two-Year Salvage Timber Sale Program," in essence would have ordered the U.S. Forest Service to sell as much as 3.2 billion board feet of "salvage" timber from national forests. It would have allowed logging of trees killed by windstorms, fire, insects or disease and permitted selective thinning of forests to control forest fires. The legislation, pushed hard by timber companies, also would have forced the Forest Service to sell twice as many trees as it felt appropriate. Further, these sales would have been exempt from environmental review and public comment. Worst of all, the language was so vague that virtually any tree, living or dead, standing or fallen, could have been defined as "salvage," even the dwindling stands of old-growth redwoods in California's national forests. For these reasons Clinton should stick to his guns as Republicans seek to include this nasty amendment in a compromise rescissions package. The President reportedly is considering accepting it.

Even the staid *Sunset Magazine* highlights a special report entitled "The Crisis in Our Forests" in its current issue. *Sunset* doubts that stepped-up salvage operations would markedly improve forest health or prevent the spread of wildfires.

The salvage amendment has nothing to do with cutting wasteful government spending but everything to do with wasteful cutting. The President must hold firm—the amendment must go.

[From the Washington Post, May 3, 1995]

CHOPPING BLOCK

It isn't just spending that would be cut by the bills the House and Senate passed a month ago rescinding appropriations for the current fiscal year. A fair amount of timber would likely be cut, too—cut down, that is. Each version of the bill includes a rider aimed at sharply increasing the timber harvest this year and next in the federal forests.

If the riders did no more than urge an increase in the harvest or order that the harvest be as large as possible under the law, that would be fair enough. There's always a great dispute about the amount of timber that can best be taken from the national forests and other public lands. The total the past few years has been well below the level to which the industry became accustomed in the 1970s and 1980s. The timber lobby says the cut should be increased—it argues among much else that there is currently an enormous

amount of dead and dying timber in the forest that will otherwise go to waste—and the new majority in Congress agrees.

But the riders don't stop there. To make sure that no obstacles in the form of conservation laws, environmental groups and courts can stand in the way, they also take the extraordinary step of suspending for the purpose of this "salvage timber sale" the entire array of federal forest management and environmental statutes that might otherwise apply. Timbering undertaken under terms of the riders "shall be deemed to satisfy" such laws no matter what their requirements, the riders say. The House version also seeks to overcome any existing court orders that might interfere with the sale; it says the sale can be conducted despite them.

The industry says the reason for all this is not just that it wants to increase the cut and has a receptive Congress but that an emergency exists in the forests. Because they are so overgrown, there's a greatly increased danger of fire, and their health has declined in other ways that a stepped-up salvage operation will help to cure—so say the supporters. They add that without suspension of the laws, environmental groups will go to court and block the necessary actions.

Opponents of the riders, including the administration, say the necessary salvage cutting can go on without suspension of the laws—a lot of salvage cutting occurs every year already—and that suspension would only be a license to log where otherwise the companies could not, in ways that would leave the forests less healthy, not more.

The opponents make the more plausible case. This is grabby legislation. If there is a genuine need to increase salvage and other such operations in the forests, even to increase them rapidly, surely that can be done without abandoning the entire framework of supporting law. Likewise, if Congress wants to change the law with regard to management of the forests, it ought to do so in the normal way, not tack a decision of such importance on the back of a supplemental appropriations bill. The measure is shortly to go to conference; the conferees should cut the budget, not the trees.

[From the Denver Post, May 8, 1995]

CLINTON SHOULD VETO TIMBER BILL

President Bill Clinton should veto a timber measure because the proposal is bad environmental policy and a shoddy way to make federal law.

The timber proposal is buried in a larger measure that deals with trimming federal spending. Clinton compromised with Senate Republicans to make the rescissions bill, as the main measure is called, less draconian than the first version adopted by the U.S. House.

However, the larger bill has been burdened with a bunch of special-interests, anti-environmental provisions. The worst would let logging companies cut an enormous amount of extra timber from the national forests. Gluing such harvesting proposals onto an already complex and controversial measure is a deceitful way to mold federal law, so they all should be removed from the bill.

Actually, the Senate would have stripped the timbering portions from the measure weeks ago, except Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Colorado's junior U.S. senator, deserted his moderate environmental leanings and voted to keep the logging provisions in the main bill. Coloradans who had hoped Campbell would remain an independent voice even after he changed from a Democrat into a Republican were sorely disappointed by his partisan performance on this matter.

There are ways to cut timber, including methods to salvage lumber from dead or

dying trees, without severely damaging the forests. But this measure is especially troubling because it tosses aside most environmental considerations the Forest Service usually weighs before deciding how much logging to allow.

When the rescissions bill lands on Clinton's desk, the President should veto it because of the timber and other environmental provisions. When Congress votes whether to override the veto, Campbell this time should side with common sense instead of letting his new partisan allies dictate his behavior.

SHIFT IN U.S. TIMBER POLICY PUTS FORESTS, FISH AND WILDLIFE AT RISK—CONGRESS MOVES TOO FAST, WITH TOO LITTLE THOUGHT

The pendulum in the nation's timber policy is swinging too fast and too wide.

The public has become accustomed—dazed may be the correct term—to the daily headlines of sharply revised public policy on welfare, immigration, food programs and more.

But the sudden shift in federal timber policy is more than even the most blasé citizen may be able to accept.

The U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee has followed the House's lead in opening big areas of our national forests to harvesting without the normal regulations to protect fish, wildlife and the environment and without allowing the public to bring legal challenges.

The committee-passed proposal directs the forest service to set aside existing environmental laws. Although the original intent of the legislation was to speed up the salvage of dead and dying timber, this measure may go beyond that. It gives sole discretion to the Forest Service to harvest wherever it wants. Only designated wilderness areas are off-limits.

No one can be sure what forests and what areas might be subject to harvesting—or how carefully it would be done.

The public will not stand by and watch the years of protecting our forests against environmental damage be wiped out in a spurt of action by a Congress that has so many pro-harvest allies in its midst.

Our forests can be harvested without damage to our environment. But doing so requires more scientific and technical thought than Congress appears willing to devote. The final protection against abuse is the legal system. If that access also is prohibited, then all of us should worry.

Citizens should demand that Congress slow down and remember its stewardship duties to the public land.

Narrowly focused salvage harvesting is acceptable. Abandoning our traditions of environmental protection and legal accountability is not.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 1944, the revised emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill for fiscal year 1995.

It is time for Congress to complete this bill and provide the emergency disaster assistance that is needed in at least 40 States to respond to natural disasters.

It is time to complete action on the rescissions in the bill so that agencies can close out the fiscal year, and Congress can address the funding issues for the new fiscal year. The Senate will be turning to the fiscal year 1996 funding bills this week.

I am pleased that the President will support this bill. It provides funding

the administration requested to respond to the tragic bombing in Oklahoma City and to carry out a proposed counterterrorism initiative.

Mr. President, the bill before us will save \$15.3 billion in budget authority

and \$0.6 billion in outlays from the current fiscal year through the rescissions in the bill. As chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the relationship of the bill to the Senate Ap-

propriations Committee's budget allocation be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 1944, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RESCISSIONS

[Fiscal year 1995, in millions of dollars, CBO scoring]

Subcommittee	Current status ¹	H.R. 1994 ²	Subcommittee total	Senate 602(b) allocation	Total comp to allocation
Agriculture—RD	BA	58,117	—82	58,035	58,118 —83
	OT	50,330	—30	50,300	50,330 —30
Commerce—Justice ³	BA	26,693	—290	26,403	26,903 —500
	OT	25,387	—99	25,288	25,429 —141
Defense	BA	241,008	—50	240,958	243,630 —2,672
	OT	249,560	—38	249,522	250,713 —1,191
District of Columbia	BA	712	—	712	720 —8
	OT	714	—	714	722 —8
Energy—Water	BA	20,293	—234	20,059	20,493 —434
	OT	20,784	—52	20,732	20,749 —17
Foreign Operations	BA	13,537	—117	13,654	13,830 —176
	OT	13,762	—241	14,003	14,005 —2
Interior	BA	13,577	—282	13,295	13,582 —287
	OT	13,968	—79	13,889	13,970 —81
Labor—HHS ⁴	BA	265,870	—2,520	263,350	266,170 —2,820
	OT	265,718	—212	265,506	265,731 —225
Legislative Branch	BA	2,459	—17	2,443	2,460 —17
	OT	2,472	—12	2,459	2,472 —13
Military Construction	BA	8,735	—	8,735	8,837 —102
	OT	8,519	—	8,519	8,519 —0
Transportation	BA	14,193	—2,624	11,568	14,275 —2,707
	OT	37,085	—22	37,063	37,072 —9
Treasury—Postal ⁵	BA	23,589	—639	22,950	23,757 —807
	OT	24,221	—40	24,181	24,225 —44
VA—HUD	BA	89,891	—8,354	81,537	90,257 —8,720
	OT	92,438	—126	92,312	92,439 —127
Reserve	BA	—	—325	—325	2,311 —2,636
	OT	—	—130	—130	1 —131
Total appropriations ⁶	BA	778,674	—15,300	763,374	785,343 —21,969
	OT	804,957	—600	804,358	806,377 —2,019

¹ In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, these totals do not include \$3,905 million in budget authority and \$7,442 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$841 million in budget authority and \$917 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount as an emergency requirement.

² In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, these totals do not include \$3,455 million in budget authority and \$443 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and/or the Congress.

³ Of the amounts remaining under the Commerce-Justice Subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, \$17.1 million in budget authority and \$1.2 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

⁴ Of the amounts remaining under the Labor-HHS Subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, \$27.0 million in budget authority and \$5.8 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

⁵ Of the amounts remaining under the Treasury-Postal Subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, \$1.3 million in budget authority and \$0.1 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

⁶ Of the amounts remaining under the Appropriations Committee's 602(a) allocation, \$68.8 million in budget authority and \$9.9 million in outlays is available only for appropriations from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has another 11 minutes 33 seconds left.

Mr. HATFIELD. I have 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HATFIELD. The proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have 11 minutes 32 seconds available.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DOLLYE HANNA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, each day, members of this body rise to pay tribute to men and women who have had an impact on our Nation in one manner or another. On any given day the RECORD will contain passages praising elected officials, captains of industry, and others who have accumulated a list of accomplishments that are usually nothing less than impressive and oftentimes enviable. Today, I want to

recognize a woman who does not possess such a vita, but is nevertheless worthy of recognition, the late Mrs. Dollye Hanna, who recently passed away at the age of 98.

Though Mrs. Hanna, or "Momma Doll" as she was affectionately known by her family and friends, was not involved in either public service or the private sector, she did dedicate her life to the noblest endeavor there is, her family. In her almost century on this earth, she was a loving wife, mother, grandmother, great grandmother, and great-great grandmother. She set an example for kindness and caring, and as the matriarch of the family, she left her strong mark and influence on four generations of Hannas.

During a service held in her memory last month, Mrs. Hanna was remembered as a woman who was: a lady; a mother; a friend; someone who spanned time; and as a child of The Father. I cannot think of a more flattering or appropriate manner in which to remember this special woman who devoted herself to caring for her husband, children, and extended family. She is someone who will certainly be missed by all those who knew her, and my sympathies go out to all those who knew and cared for this remarkable lady, especially her grandchildren: E.G. Meybohm; Robert L. Meybohm; Dollye W. Ward; Mildred W. Ghetti; and Hanna W. Fowler.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:55 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2020. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated: